

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/020,782	MEMORY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tho v Duong	3743	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tho v Duong. (3) _____.

(2) Jeffery N. Fairchild. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 March 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 8,13,20 and 23.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hoshino, Martin and Stoynoff.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative presents remark pertaining the arguments of combination Hoshino and other secondary references. Applicant's representative and examiner understand each other regarding the arguments in the Remarks and the Office Action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required